



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,861	10/22/2001	Hawley K. Rising III	080398.P432	1947
8791 7590 08/24/2007 BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			EXAMINER PATEL, MANGLESH M	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/24/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/044,861

Applicant(s)

RISING ET AL.

Examiner

Manglesh M. Patel

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>Jun 8, 2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This **Non-Final** action is responsive to the RCE and IDS filed on 6/8/2007.
2. Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 11, 14, 18, 22 and 26-28 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 6/8/2007 has been entered, and considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this

Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-13 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Costello (NPL---How an XML Instance Document References an XML Schema, Jan 2000) in view of Villard (NPL---An Xml-based multimedia document processing model for content adaptation, Sep 2000) further in view of Hunter (NPL---Multimedia Content Description Interface, May 2000).

Regarding Independent claims 1, 8 & 11, Costello discloses *a computerized method of encoding multimedia content descriptions for a specific application domain comprising: obtaining an instance document* (pg 1, paragraphs 5-8 & pg 2, paragraphs 2-9 & pg 3 paragraphs 1-7, wherein Costello explicitly describes the use of an instance document with a schema including the declaration of namespaces for the elements). Costello fails to explicitly teach the mapping of the namespace using XSTL. Villard teaches *transforming the instance document from the general application domain to the specific application domain by mapping from a general application namespace to a specific application namespace wherein the specific application domain supports fewer multimedia description elements than the general application domain and includes a new multimedia description element derived from multimedia description elements in the general application domain, the new multimedia description element not included in the general application domain* (section 4, wherein XSLT is used to transform the document and perform the mapping of the namespaces described by Costello. The purpose of the XSLT in general is to convert in a specific format for a specific device therefore it includes mapping the namespace elements from a general to a specific. Namespaces are used to differentiate and

identify elements used in multiple documents, for example package for a home element may differ from package for the office element. Further Hunter describes the validation of xml documents including using namespaces, see pg 3, paragraph 1. Hunter shows the validation of the multimedia content descriptors using an XML schema with a general namespace prior to using a XSLT to convert the namespace to a specific format has described by Villard on pg 7, paragraph 3. Villard in pg 9 section 6 teaches the use of adaptation parameters that are defined within the transformation sheet, such allows a generic element such as screen size to be specified as a range describe on pg 10 paragraphs 1-2. He teaches that rules are applied to the multimedia document without modifying the source document, hence the presentation document is tailored to the specific device with specific multimedia description elements derived from the rules specified by the ranged values within the transformation document without modifying the source or generic document structure). Villard fails to explicitly teach the descriptors of the multimedia content. Hunter discloses *that encodes the descriptions of multimedia content for a general application domain* (section 0.1, 5.1, 5.2.1 & 6.1, wherein Hunter describes the use of descriptions for multimedia content in a general application domain using the XML Schema language with MPEG-7); Costello explicitly teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify a target namespace. Villard teaches the adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations. Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including descriptors defined using DDL. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia content descriptions for a general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying names of descriptors and description schemes that include schemas from multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hunter, Villard and Costello for the benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from multiple different namespaces.

Regarding Dependent claims 2, 9 & 12, Costello fails to disclose the binarization of the instance document. Hunter discloses *creating a binary instance document from the transformed instance document* (foreword, part 2, wherein the description definition language includes the binary representation of the DDL expressions). Costello explicitly teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify a target namespace. Villard teaches the adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations. Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including descriptors defined using DDL. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia content descriptions for a general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying

names of descriptors and description schemes that include schemas from multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hunter, Villard and Costello for the benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from multiple different namespaces.

Regarding Dependent claims 3, 10 & 13, Costello fails to teach a frequency table. Hunter discloses *deriving a frequency table from the specific application namespace* (section 0.1, 5.1, 5.2.1 & 6.1 & foreword, part 2, wherein a table for recording the frequency of the descriptors from the specific namespace is derived); *and using the frequency table to encode the binary instance document* (section 0.1, 5.1, 5.2.1 & 6.1 & foreword, part 2, wherein encoding includes the use of the DDL encoder which converts the instance document into a binary instance document using the frequency of the descriptors). Costello explicitly teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify a target namespace. Villard teaches the adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations. Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including descriptors defined using DDL. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia content descriptions for a general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying names of descriptors and description schemes that include schemas from multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hunter, Villard and Costello for the benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from multiple different namespaces.

Regarding Dependent claims 4, with dependency of claim 1, Costello discloses *wherein the specific application namespace includes elements in the general application namespace* (pg 1, paragraphs 5-8 & pg 2, paragraphs 2-9 & pg 3 paragraphs 1-7, wherein the elements in the specific namespace includes elements in the general namespace).

Regarding Dependent claim 5, with dependency of claim 1, Costello fails to teach data description language. Hunter discloses *wherein the general application namespace is defined by a data description language specified by MPEG-7* (section 0.1, 5.1, 5.2.1 & 6.1 & foreword, part 2, wherein a data description language including MPEG-7 is used to define the general application namespace). Costello explicitly teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify a target namespace. Villard teaches the adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations. Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including

descriptors defined using DDL. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia content descriptions for a general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying names of descriptors and description schemes that include schemas from multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hunter, Villard and Costello for the benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from multiple different namespaces.

Regarding Dependent claim 6, with dependency of claim 1, Costello fails to teach data description language. Hunter discloses *wherein the specific application namespace is defined by an application specific description language* (section 0.1, 5.1, 5.2.1 & 6.1 & foreword, part 2, wherein the specific namespace is defined by an application specific description language).

Regarding Dependent claim 7, with dependency of claim 1, Costello fails to explicitly teach the mapping of the namespace using XSTL. Villard teaches *wherein the mapping is defined in an extensible markup language style-sheet translation document* (section 4, wherein XSLT is used to transform the document and perform the mapping of the namespaces described by Costello). Costello explicitly teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify a target namespace. Villard teaches the adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations. Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including descriptors defined using DDL. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia content descriptions for a general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying names of descriptors and description schemes that include schemas from multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hunter, Villard and Costello for the benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from multiple different namespaces.

6. Claims 14-28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Costello (NPL---How an XML Instance Document References an XML Schema, Jan 2000) in view of Hunter (NPL---Multimedia Content Description Interface, May 2000) further in view of Villard (NPL---An Xml-based multimedia document processing model for content adaptation, Sep 2000).

Regarding Independent claim 14, 18 & 22, Costello discloses *creating, by the server, a binary instance document from the transformed instance document* (pg 1, paragraphs 5-8 & pg 2, paragraphs 2-9 & pg 3 paragraphs 1-7, wherein Costello explicitly describes the use of an instance document with a schema including the declaration of namespaces for the elements); Costello fails to disclose the binarization of the instance document. Hunter teaches the creation of a binary instance document from a transformed instance document (foreword, part 2, wherein the description definition language includes the binary representation of the DDL expressions). Hunter discloses *transforming, by a server, an instance document from a general application domain to the specific application domain, wherein the instance document encodes the descriptions of multimedia content in the general application domain, and wherein the specific application domain supports fewer multimedia description elements than the general application domain and includes a new multimedia description element derived from multimedia description elements in the general application domain, the new multimedia description element not included in the general application domain* (section 0.1, 5.1, 5.2.1 & 6.1, wherein Hunter describes the use of descriptions for multimedia content in a general application domain using the XML Schema language with MPEG-7. Hunter teaches in section 4, wherein XSLT is used to transform the document and perform the mapping of the namespaces described by Costello. The purpose of the XSLT in general is to convert in a specific format for a specific device therefore it includes mapping the namespace elements from a general to a specific. Namespaces are used to differentiate and identify elements used in multiple documents, for example package for a home element may differ from package for the office element. Further Hunter describes the validation of xml documents including using namespaces, see pg 3, paragraph 1. Hunter shows the validation of the multimedia content descriptors using an XML schema with a general namespace prior to using a XSLT to convert the namespace to a specific format has described by Villard on pg 7, paragraph 3. Villard in pg 9 section 6 teaches the use of adaptation parameters that are defined within the transformation sheet, such allows a generic element such as screen size to be specified as a range describe on pg 10 paragraphs 1-2. He teaches that rules are applied to the multimedia document without modifying the source document, hence the presentation document is tailored to the specific device with specific multimedia description elements derived from the rules specified by the ranged values within the transformation document without modifying the source or generic document structure). Hunter fails to describe the transformation of the instance document. Villard teaches the transformation of the instance document from a general domain to a specific domain (section 4, wherein XSLT is used to transform the document and perform the mapping of the namespaces described by Costello). Villard discloses *transmitting, by the server, the binary instance document to the client upon request from the client* (sections 1 & 6 & fig 5, wherein the document is transmitted to a client upon a request). Costello explicitly teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify a

target namespace. Villard teaches the adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations. Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including descriptors defined using DDL. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia content descriptions for a general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying names of descriptors and description schemes that include schemas from multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Villard, Hunter and Costello for the benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from multiple different namespaces.

Regarding Dependent claims 15, 21 & 25, Costello fails to disclose the binarization of the instance document. Hunter teaches the creation of a binary instance document from a transformed instance document (foreword, part 2, wherein the description definition language includes the binary representation of the DDL expressions). Villard discloses *receiving, by the client, the binary instance document from the server* (sections 1 & 6 & fig 5, wherein the document is transmitted to a client upon a request from a server); *and recreating, by the client, the transformed instance document from the binary instance document* (sections 1 & 6 & fig 5, wherein the document is transmitted and recreated by the client). Costello explicitly teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify a target namespace. Villard teaches the adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations. Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including descriptors defined using DDL. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia content descriptions for a general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying names of descriptors and description schemes that include schemas from multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Villard, Hunter and Costello for the benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from multiple different namespaces.

Regarding Dependent claims 16, 19 & 23, Costello fails to explicitly teach the mapping of the namespace using XSTL. Villard teaches *wherein transforming the instance document comprises: mapping from a general application namespace to a specific application namespace* (section 4, wherein XSLT is used to transform the document and perform the mapping of the namespaces described by Costello). Costello explicitly teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify a target namespace. Villard teaches the

adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations. Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including descriptors defined using DDL. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia content descriptions for a general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying names of descriptors and description schemes that include schemas from multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Villard, Hunter and Costello for the benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from multiple different namespaces.

Regarding Dependent claim 17, 20 & 24, Costello fails to teach a frequency table. Hunter discloses *deriving, by the server, a frequency table from the specific application namespace* (section 0.1, 5.1, 5.2.1 & 6.1 & foreword, part 2, wherein a table for recording the frequency of the descriptors from the specific namespace is derived); *and using, by the server, the frequency table to encode the binary instance document* (section 0.1, 5.1, 5.2.1 & 6.1 & foreword, part 2, wherein encoding includes the use of the DDL encoder which converts the instance document into a binary instance document using the frequency of the descriptors). Costello explicitly teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify a target namespace. Villard teaches the adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations. Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including descriptors defined using DDL. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia content descriptions for a general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying names of descriptors and description schemes that include schemas from multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hunter, Villard and Costello for the benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from multiple different namespaces.

Regarding Independent claims 26-28, Costello discloses *receiving, by the client, a binary instance document* (pg 1, paragraphs 5-8 & pg 2, paragraphs 2-9 & pg 3 paragraphs 1-7, wherein Costello explicitly describes the use of an instance document with a schema including the declaration of namespaces for the elements); Costello fails to disclose the binarization of the instance document. Hunter teaches the creation of a binary instance document from a transformed instance document (foreword, part 2, wherein the description definition language includes the binary representation of the DDL expressions). Hunter discloses *recreating, by the client, a transformed instance document*

from the binary instance document, wherein the transformed instance document encodes the descriptions of multimedia content in the specific application domain as a result of transforming an instance document that encodes the descriptions of multimedia content in a general application domain, and wherein the specific application domain supports fewer multimedia description elements than the general application domain and includes a new multimedia description element derived from multimedia description elements in the general application domain, the new multimedia description element not included in the general application domain (section 0.1, 5.1, 5.2.1 & 6.1, wherein Hunter describes the use of descriptions for multimedia content in a general application domain using the XML Schema language with MPEG-7. Hunter teaches in section 4, wherein XSLT is used to transform the document and perform the mapping of the namespaces described by Costello. The purpose of the XSLT in general is to convert in a specific format for a specific device therefore it includes mapping the namespace elements from a general to a specific. Namespaces are used to differentiate and identify elements used in multiple documents, for example package for a home element may differ from package for the office element. Further Hunter describes the validation of xml documents including using namespaces, see pg 3, paragraph 1. Hunter shows the validation of the multimedia content descriptors using an XML schema with a general namespace prior to using a XSLT to convert the namespace to a specific format has described by Villard on pg 7, paragraph 3. Villard in pg 9 section 6 teaches the use of adaptation parameters that are defined within the transformation sheet, such allows a generic element such as screen size to be specified as a range describe on pg 10 paragraphs 1-2. He teaches that rules are applied to the multimedia document without modifying the source document, hence the presentation document is tailored to the specific device with specific multimedia description elements derived from the rules specified by the ranged values within the transformation document without modifying the source or generic document structure). Hunter fails to describe the transformation of the instance document. Villard teaches the transformation of the instance document from a general domain to a specific domain (section 4, wherein XSLT is used to transform the document and perform the mapping of the namespaces described by Costello). Costello explicitly teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify a target namespace. Villard teaches the adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations. Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including descriptors defined using DDL. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia content descriptions for a general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying names of descriptors and description schemes that include schemas from multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of

Hunter, Villard and Costello for the benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from multiple different namespaces.

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. [[See, MPEP 2123]].

Response to Arguments

7. Applicants Arguments filed 6/8/2007 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant argues: However, Villard's transformation process transforms from a specific level to a generic level. Applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to the top of Figure 7 where an arrow points from the specific level to the generic level (Villard pg 8) and to the bottom of fig 7 where an arrow points from an XML document (specific) to a DTD (generic). In addition, the top arrow is marked as "import/include" which further supports Applicants interpretation that Villard transforms from the specific to the generic. (see pg 9, paragraph 3)

However The Examiner respectfully disagrees: Applicant points to figure 7 and derives a conclusion without providing a reasonable and logical explanation as to it's meaning. Examiner agrees that the figure shows 2 levels of transformation described as Specific and Generic, however they bear no relation to the generic and specific as claimed in the instant application. Instead what Villard actually teaches is that two levels of transformations exist, the generic and the specific level. The generic level allows the transformation of any valid XML document if it conforms to the DTD or schema, whereas the Specific level provides transformation based on a particular document or instance, such bears no relation as to the transformation of specific and generic elements as claimed (see pg 7, section 4 and pg 8, paragraphs 1-4). Furthermore what figure 7 actually discloses is that two levels are part of the transformation process and that one relies on DTD validation (generic) whereas the other (specific) relies on the instance document such as that with arrow shown in fig 7. Furthermore the arrow, which describes import/include, actually details that both specific and generic level transformation processes are supported. For example when analyzing the code on pg 8 it can be seen that various include statements are used to reference the spatial sheet, timesheet and logical sheet that support the two types of transformations. Furthermore he shows fragments for a generic sheet, which in this case is validated

against a DTD prior to transformation, such bears no relation as to its actual generic and specific elements as claimed. Villard shows that both of the levels can be applied in a single transformation process, which operate differently for each dimension of a multimedia document. The process of converting an XML document which represents a generic document to a specific document which is the target document adapted for a mobile device (see pg 9, section 6) is done by following the rules specified in a DTD or Schema shown in fig 7. Such allows transformation of a basic XML document to multiple devices which have specific requirements such as screen size, supported color, supported fonts etc. As such applicants argument is flawed. (Note: The reference disclosed in the IDS also discusses the conversion from generic to specific for display on mobile devices. However Villard already discloses these features and it may be used in future arguments to further support any rejections as necessary).

It is not necessary that the references actually suggest, expressly or in so many words the changes or improvements that applicant has made. The test for combining references is what the references as a whole would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re Sheckler, 168 USPQ 716 (CCPA 1971); In re McLaughlin 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971); In re Young 159 USPQ 725 (CCPA 1968).


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M,F 8:30-6:00 T,TH 8:30-3:00 Wed 8:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571)272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel
Patent Examiner
August 20, 2007



CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER